

# **Making      Gastrointestinal Endoscopy Safer**

**Sanjay Ramrakha MBBS FRACGP FACEM**

**A thesis submitted in accordance with the total  
requirements for admission to the degree of Doctor of  
Philosophy.**

**Year of Submission: 2012**

**University of Technology, Sydney**

## **CERTIFICATE OF AUTHORSHIP / ORIGINALITY**

I hereby certify that the work in this thesis has not been previously submitted for a degree nor has it been submitted as part of requirements for a degree, except as fully acknowledged within the text.

**X**

---

Dr Sanjay Ramrakha

## **Acknowledgement**

This project was carried out over a number of years and with considerable assistance. I would like to acknowledge the tireless work done by the research department of the Centre for Digestive Diseases, Five Dock headed by Adjunct Professor Thomas Borody. The Centre has led the field of gastroenterology in several areas in spite of its suburban location. I am particularly grateful to the patients who have volunteered to trial the inventions described in this thesis. I would like to thank my supervisor Associate Professor Loraine Holley who assisted and encouraged my progress. I would also have to thank my family who have seen me as a perpetual student in the fields of Medicine and Science and my parents who instilled this interest in me.

# CONTENTS

## INTRODUCTION AND LITERATURE REVIEW

1.1 History of Endoscopy .....	1
1.2 Safety Issues of Endoscopy .....	2
1.2.1 PROCEDURAL COMPLICATIONS .....	4
1.2.2 COMPLICATIONS ASSOCIATED WITH SEDATION .....	8
1.2.3 COMPLICATIONS ASSOCIATED WITH BOWEL PREPARATION .....	30
1.3 Conclusion.....	47

## CHAPTER 2 AUSTRALIAN ENDOSCOPIC PRACTICE - SURVEY OF SEDATION PRACTICE IN ENDOSCOPIC UNITS IN AUSTRALIA

2.1 Introduction .....	49
2.2 Methods.....	50
2.3 Results.....	51
2.4 Discussion .....	64

## PART A OXYGENATION AND VENTILATION ISSUES ASSOCIATED WITH SEDATION..... 66

## CHAPTER 3 MONITORING CARDIO-RESPIRATORY PARAMETERS DURING SEDATION AND THE IMPACT OF ENDOSCOPY ..... 66

3.1 Introduction .....	66
3.2 Methods.....	68
3.3 Results.....	70
3.4 Discussion .....	75

## CHAPTER 4 DESIGN AND DEVELOPMENT OF TWINGUARD™ FOR SEDATION MONITORING AND OXYGENATION ..... 78

4.1 Introduction .....	78
4.2 Aim of Design.....	81
4.3 Prototype design .....	81

## CHAPTER 5 TWINGUARD® VERSUS NASAL PRONG AND CONVENTIONAL BITE BLOCK - A COMPARATIVE STUDY ..... 89

5.1 Introduction .....	89
5.2 Materials and Methods .....	89
5.2.1 PRE- PROCEDURE ASSESSMENTS .....	91
5.2.2 PROCEDURAL ASSESSMENTS.....	91
5.2.3 DATA ANALYSES .....	93
5.3 Results.....	93

5.3.1 EFFICACY RESULTS- OXYGEN SATURATION.....	95
5.3.2 POST PROCEDURE .....	100
5.4 Discussion .....	101

## PART B SAFETY OF BOWEL PREPARATIONS

### CHAPTER 6 DESIGN AND DEVELOPMENT OF NOVEL

BOWEL PREPARATION .....	103
6.1 Introduction .....	103
6.2 Development of Initial Concept .....	105
6.3 Materials and Methods .....	107
6.3.1 INVESTIGATIVE PRODUCTS .....	107
6.3.2 RANDOMIZATION AND BOWEL PURGATIVE GROUPS .....	108
6.3.3 EFFICACY AND SAFETY ANALYSES .....	108
6.3.4 STATISTICAL ANALYSES.....	110
6.4 Results .....	111
6.4.1 PATIENTS.....	111
6.4.2 RANDOMISATION AND TREATMENT ARMS .....	111
6.4.3 TREATMENT COMPLIANCE .....	112
6.4.4 COMPARISON OF EFFICACY ACCORDING TO PROCEDURALIST EVALUATION .....	112
6.4.5 COMPARISON OF EFFICACY ACCORDING TO SEDATIONIST EVALUATION ..	114
6.4.6 COMPARISON OF TOLERABILITY AND PALATABILITY .....	116
6.5Evaluation on safety.....	118
6.5.1 ADVERSE EVENTS .....	118
6.5.2 CLINICAL LABORATORY EVALUATION .....	121
6.6 DISCUSSION .....	124
CHAPTER 7 NEW FORMULATION OF A SOLID BOWEL PREPARATION	
7.1 Introduction .....	126
7.2 Clinical Practice Observations.....	129
7.2.1 METHODOLOGY .....	129
7.3 Results.....	132
7.3.1 RESULTS USING 20MG PICOSULPHATE AND 10G MANNITOL.....	132
7.3.2 RESULTS USING 25MG SODIUM PICOSULPHATE WITH 10 G MANNITOL.....	133
7.3.3 RESULTS USING 28.8MG SODIUM PICOSULPHATE WITH 10G MANNITOL ..	135
7.3.4 RESULTS USING 38.5MG SODIUM PICOSULPHATE WITH 10G MANNITOL ..	137
7.4 Combined Result.....	140

7.5 Reducing Explosive Potential .....	141
7.6 New formulations .....	144
7.6.1 FORMULATION 1 .....	144
7.6.2 FORMULATION 2 .....	144
7.6.3 OTHER FORMULATION.....	145
7.7 Illumination .....	147
CHAPTER 8 GLOBAL CONCLUSION.....	149

## APPENDICES

Appendix 1 – “Safety in Endoscopy” survey .....	154
Appendix 2 – “Safety in Endoscopy” cover letter .....	156
Appendix 3- Australian Gastroenterology Week 2008 – Poster Presentation - Endoscopic Sedation in Australia .....	157
Appendix 4 – Australian Gastroenterology Week 2005 – Poster Presentation - Effects of Supplemental Oxygen During Endoscopy. ....	158
Appendix 5 – Development of Twinguard™ .....	159
Appendix 6 – Australian standard patent issued for Twinguard™ .....	170
Appendix 7 – Instructions for Twinguard™ use.....	171
Appendix 8 – FDA registration advice .....	174
Appendix 9 – Digestive Diseases Week 2008 Poster Presentation – Twinguard™ vs Oronasal Capnography .....	176
Appendix 10 – Patient evaluation form used to assess colonoscopy bowel preparation in clinical trial .....	177
Appendix 11 – Doctor and sedationist evaluation forms used in clinical trial .....	178
Appendix 12 – Australian Gastroenterology Week 2006 Poster Presentation- Bowel Purgative .....	180
Appendix 13 – Australian patent – Electrolyte purgative .....	181
Appendix 14 – Solid bowel purgative evaluation forms.....	198
Appendix 15 – Doctor/sedationist evaluation form for solid bowel preparation.....	201

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

REFERENCES.....	202
FOOTNOTES .....	219

## List of Tables

Table 1.1	Examples of some of the products available for bowel preparation	34
Table 1.2	Current bowel preparation products and their constituents	34
Table 1.3	Drugs causing hyponatraemia	35
Table 2.1	Demographic details of public hospitals - Metropolitan (Met) and Regional (Reg)	52
Table 2.2	Demographic details of private hospitals - Metropolitan (Met) and Regional (Reg)	53
Table 2.3	Approximate number of reported complications in the year 2005-2006	61
Table 2.4	Reported deaths associated with endoscopic procedures in the past 10 years.	63
Table 3.1	Sedation level classification from American Anesthesiologists Task Force on sedation and analgesia by Non Anesthesiologist	67
Table 3.2	ASA classification of physical status (circa 1941)	69
Table 3.3	Correlation of oxygen saturation and body weight (ANOVA)	73
Table 3.4	Effect of respiratory function on oxygen saturation a)following sedation b)with supplemental oxygen and c)during endoscopy	74
Table 3.5	Relationship between changes in O <sub>2</sub> saturation, HR, ETCO <sub>2</sub> and RR following a)sedation with b)supplemental oxygen and c)during endoscopy	74
Table 5.1	Inclusion/Exclusion criteria	90
Table 5.2	Characteristics of the TwinGuard® (ON) and Nasal Cannula (NC) group.	94
Table 5.3	Pre procedure PFER, height, weight, age and sedation requirements in the Nasal Cannula group	94
Table 5.4	Pre procedure PFER, height, and weight, age and sedation requirements in the TwinGuard® group	95
Table 5.5	Patient comfort comparisons between TwinGuard™ and Nasal Cannula group	100
Table 6.1	Dosage schedule of the four treatment groups	108

Table 6.2	Doctor/Sedationist evaluation scale of overall adequacy of colonic cleansing	109
Table 6.3	Number of patients per treatment arm	112
Table 6.4	Adverse event comparison GlycoPrep™ with Hypertonic Solution and PicoPrep™ capsules	118
Table 6.5	Adverse event comparisons – GlycoPrep™ with PicoPrep™ capsules	119
Table 6.6	Adverse event comparison –Hypertonic Solution and PicoPrep™ capsules with PicoPrep™ capsules alone	119
Table 6.7	Adverse event comparison - ‘PicoPrep™ sachets’ with Hypertonic Solution and PicoPrep™ capsules	120
Table 6.8	Adverse event comparison - ‘PicoPrep™ sachets’ PicoPrep™ capsules	120
Table 7.1	Formulation used in initial doctor observations	129
Table 7.2	Evaluation grade used to assess quality of bowel preparation	130
Table 7.3	Incidence and frequency of adverse effects in 20mg sodium picosulphate /10g mannitol cohort (N=29)	133
Table 7.4	Incidence and frequency of adverse effects in 25mg sodium picosulphate/10g mannitol cohort (N=28)	135
Table 7.5	Incidence and frequency of adverse effects in 28.8mg sodium picosulphate/10g mannitol cohort (N=22)	137
Table 7.6	Incidence and frequency of adverse effects in 38.4mg sodium picosulphate /10g mannitol cohort (N=81)	139



## List of Figures

Figure 1.1	Pentax™ Gastroscope	1
Figure 1.2	Endoscopy room; Professor Thomas Borody at the Centre for Digestive Diseases	3
Figure 1.3	Examples of colonic polyps and removal using a snare	30
Figure 1.4	Examples of inadequate bowel prepped colons with faecal matter lining the mucosa	31
Figure 1.5	Cases of renal failure or nephrocalcinosis associated with sodium phosphate or polyethylene glycol.	
	Reports to FDA January 2001-2007 (Belsey J, 2009)	40
Figure 2.1	Number of proceduralists in private and public hospitals	54
Figure 2.2	Percentage of Participation in the provision of sedation in public and private units	55
Figure 3.1	Patient with use of an oxygenating bite block and nasal carbon dioxide	68
Figure 3.2	Mallampati score	69
Figure 3.3	Effect of supplemental oxygen via oxygenating mouth guard (Oxyguard® (Trawax P/L, Sydney)) in 100 patients	71
Figure 3.4	Oxygen saturation levels in 51 females undergoing gastroscopy on oxygen via Oxyguard® (Trawax P/L, Sydney)	72
Figure 3.5	Oxygen saturation levels in 49 males undergoing gastroscopy on oxygen via Oxyguard® (Trawax P/L, Sydney).	72
Figure 4.1	Conventional bite block and Oxyguard®	79
Figure 4.2	Conventional bite block in use	80
Figure 4.3	Oxyguard® (Trawax P/L, Sydney) A).oxygen connecting valve and B) in use during endoscopy	83
Figure 4.4	Prototype diagram of TwinGuard®	84
Figure 4.5	Description of TwinGuard® dimensions – general	85
Figure 4.6	TwinGuard® schematic drawing with detachable oxygenation piece –schematic drawing	86

Figure 4.7	TwinGuard® schematic of interlock detail between detachable oxygenating piece and main body of TwinGuard®	87
Figure 4.8	TwinGuard®- The final product	88
Figure 5.1	Nasal prong oxygenation devices	90
Figure 5.2	Relationship between oxygen saturation and phases of sedation, procedure and recovery	96
Figure 5.3	Comparison between TwinGuard® (ON) and Nasal Cannula (NC) for monitoring absolute ET <sub>CO</sub> <sub>2</sub> (mmHg) during sedation.	97
Figure 5.4	Comparison between TwinGuard® (ON) and Nasal Cannula (NC) for monitoring absolute ET <sub>CO</sub> <sub>2</sub> (mmHg) during endoscopy	98
Figure 5.5	Comparison between TwinGuard® (ON) and Nasal Cannula (NC) for monitoring changes from baseline in ET <sub>CO</sub> <sub>2</sub> (mmHg) initial sedation.	99
Figure 5.6	Comparison between TwinGuard® (ON) and Nasal Cannula (NC) for monitoring changes from nadir in ET <sub>CO</sub> <sub>2</sub> (mmHg) during endoscopy.	99
Figure 6.1	Visual examples of the caecum Grades 1=excellent cleaning to 4 =poor cleaning	110
Figure 6.2	Proceduralist (N=2) evaluation of general efficacy	113
Figure 6.3	Proceduralist (N=2) evaluation and rating of specific bowel region	113
Figure 6.4	Sedationist (N=2) evaluation of general efficacy	115
Figure 6.5	Sedationist (N=2) evaluation and rating of specific bowel region	115
Figure 6.6	Ease of completion according to patient evaluation	117
Figure 6.7	Palatability of bowel purgative according to patient evaluation	117
Figure 7.1	Example of modern telephony used in science	128
Figure 7.2	Depiction of “0” rating according to the Ottawa bowel scale in each of the five observed regions	131
Figure 7.3	Mean rating scale for patient cohort using formulation containing 20mg sodium picosulphate, 10g mannitol (N=29)	132
Figure 7.4	Mean rating scale for patient cohort using formulation with 25mg sodium picosulphate/10g mannitol (N=28)	134
Figure 7.5	Mean rating scale for patient cohort using formulation with 28.8mg sodium picosulphate/10g mannitol cohort (N=22)	136

Figure 7.6	Mean rating scale for patient cohort using formulation with 38.4mg sodium picosulphate/10g mannitol cohort (N=81)	138
Figure 7.7	Incidence of excellence ratings and incidence of adverse events vs. increasing doses of sodium picosulphate	141
Figure 7.8	Images of caecum captured in ten patients during colonoscopy on Bisoxatin capsule preparation 26/4/2012 to 11/5/2012	146

# ABSTRACT

Endoscopic procedures have become the ‘gold standard’ of diagnosis and therapy in the alimentary tract and are frequently delivered in high volume centres. Given that the generic term *endoscopy* is broad, in this thesis, panendoscopy will refer to “*upper gastrointestinal*” procedure and colonoscopy will refer to “*lower gastrointestinal*” procedure.

In such procedures, complications can be attributed to the bowel preparation, the procedure itself and/or the effects of the sedative/anaesthesia. This thesis reports on an anonymous postal survey of Australian practice of endoscopic procedures and identifies system issues in the delivery of sedation. In particular, there is an unacceptable morbidity and mortality rate seen in some public endoscopy units. Therefore, there is scope to improve levels of safety in gastrointestinal endoscopy.

The first half of this thesis focuses on sedation-associated cardio respiratory embarrassment, a common cause of morbidity and mortality. This thesis examines the changes in cardio- respiratory parameters associated with sedation. Expanding on this knowledge the thesis describes the development of a novel oxygenating bite-block with capacity to sample carbon dioxide. The device, when tested against conventional delivery systems in a comparative clinical study shows, superiority in monitoring of ventilation.

The second half of this thesis focuses on the complications associated with bowel preparations relating to their palatability, their purgative effect and dehydration. Effective purgation is essential to reduce the missed pathology rate. The development of a novel bowel preparation to improve safety was trialled in a comparative clinical study against three other methods. Lessons learnt from this study led to the process of further enhancement to the development to formulate a capsule bowel preparation.

Improvements in oxygen delivery, ventilation monitoring and bowel preparation described in this thesis will significantly increase the safety of gastrointestinal endoscopy